REMARKS

By this amendment, the title has been corrected to use the term "biodegradable" which appears in all the claims and in the title as translated at the top of page 1 of the specification, instead of the less colloquial term "Disasemble" which appears in the PCT publication of the application. No new matter is introduced.

Original claims 1-5 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-5 are rejected in the Office Action mailed June 27, 2005 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over Andersen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,168,857.

The claims are directed to a biodegradable resin composition and its manufacturing method. As recited in independent claim 1, the composition comprises:

(1) a carbohydrate polymer containing linear amylose molecules and branched amylopectin molecules;

(2) at least one hydrophilic resin selected from the group consisting of polyvinyl alcohol, polyacrylic acid, and polyethylene acrylic acid;

(3) a lubricant;

(4) a thermoplastic resin; and

(5) a metal soap as a stabilizer.

In addition to being biodegradable, the composition of the invention presents the following advantages:

- the composition can be produced by a simple method and at a very economic cost;
- the composition lends itself to a variety of thermoforming fabrication including extrusion, injection, and blow molding, to produce a wide range of articles such as films, envelopes, bottles and containers.

The Office Action cites Andersen et al. for disclosing biodegradable starch-based compositions and methods for manufacturing sheets thereof. Specifically, page 4 of the Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art "to elect the most advantageous weight percentages of components from those disclosed within the Andersen et al invention to achieve the greatest results of biodegradability and strength." *(emphasis added)* Thus, the basis for the rejection appears to be that the claimed composition differs from the composition disclosed in Andersen et al. only in the weight percentages of the components.

However, Andersen et al. fails to teach or suggest a composition which has all the components recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Andersen et al. does not teach or suggest the last component recited in all the claims, namely "0.5-5 wt% of metal soap as a stabilizer". The Office Action points out on page 4 that calcium carbonate is used in the compositions of Andersen et al. It is not clear why calcium carbonate is mentioned. However, in the event that the calcium carbonate used in Andersen et al. is considered to meet the terms of applicant's claims with respect to the stabilizer, that conclusion is respectfully traversed, for the following reason. Calcium carbonate is NOT a metal soap (also known as metallic soap). A metal soap is a metal salt of a fatty acid, such fatty acid being a long chain carboxylic acid, for example caproic acid, stearic acid, oleic acid, etc. There is no mention in Andersen et al. of such metal soap. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-5 over Andersen et al. is unsupported.

In view of the foregoing, the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 425-8508 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG & CARLSON, P.C.

9/27/05
Date

Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44658

10507 Braddock Road
Suite A
Fairfax, VA 22032
Tel. (703) 425-8508
Fax. (703) 425-8518